

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-17, 20-21, 23-27 and 29-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windows 95 in view of Wishnie et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's § 103 rejection of the claims.

One major difference between Wishnie and Applicants' invention is that Wishnie is mostly concerned with how to re-use or modify existing web-pages. The introduction makes this fairly clear (see e.g. col 1 line 5 to col 2 line 7). For this reason, the import routine 302 only processes HTML files (see col 7 lines 30 -45, esp. lines 31 and 44). In contrast, Applicants' invention is primarily concerned with actually creating web-pages in the first instance (although the methodology proposed does in fact also solve the problem of how to easily modify a web-site).

Thus, although Wishnie does point out that tools for converting text or images into HTML are known, it is not clear how such text would arise. Apparently, the idea is that you take the web-site to be modified, import it into the Wishnie tool, and then add additional text or images etc. using the Wishnie tool, in order to make the desired modifications. Thereafter, if you want to re-arrange the navigational hierarchy of the web-site in Wishnie, it is suggested that you use the Structure routine 304 to use a proprietary method of indicating the desired navigational hierarchy (note that this explicitly does not change the location of the corresponding files within directories etc. - see col 5 lines 36-42). In any event, it is clear that in Wishnie the basic building blocks which are played around with by a user are HTML files. Indeed, the Summary of the Invention portion of Wishnie states:

In general, in one aspect, the invention provides a method inferring navigational hierarchy for a web site from an existing file hierarchy where the existing file hierarchy includes one or more HTML files. The method includes inferring a navigational hierarchy for a web site from physical relationships between the HTML files stored in the existing file hierarchy. (Emphasis supplied.)

(See col. 2, lines 10-16 of Wishie.)

This contrasts with the present invention in which not only is a navigational hierarchy inferred from the file system hierarchy of the content files, but also the content files are converted into hypermedia files as required in all of the present claims. These are important and patentable distinctions, because they massively reduce the amount of interaction which the user needs to have with the tool of the present invention. Furthermore, it encourages the user to keep as the record of the web-site, the content files in non-HTML format, which means that the web-site can easily be modified without the user ever having to use a specialist tool for processing HTML files.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Wishnie with Windows 95 to arrive at the present invention, because Wishnie teaches away from the present invention in that Wishnie describes a tool into which earlier web-sites are "imported" and then processed using this tool - with the inherent necessity of learning how to use the tool and its own associated user interface, etc. This is exactly contrary to the aims of the present invention which seeks to avoid a user having to master yet another application/tool and its associated user interface. Instead, design of web-pages can be done using an editor with which the user is already familiar and the interaction required with the tool of the present invention is absolutely minimal.

Note that with Applicants' methodology (in which content files are created and modified using any kind of text editor, and the navigational structure provided and modified using an OS native file viewer) there is no need for the complex functionality required in Wishnie to redirect links to the correct new destination. Instead Applicants' tool is simply re-run from scratch whenever the content and/or arrangement of the underlying content files is/are changed (see page 27 lines 24-30 of the present application).

Finally, even if it would have been obvious to combine the references, Applicants' invention would not have resulted in that Wishie is only dealing with HTML files.

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all of claims 1-17, 20-21, 23-27 and 29-47. standing in the application, be allowed and that the case be passed to issue. If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a supplemental response or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone exchange indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

CC:lmr

By:


Chris Comuntzis
Reg. No. 31,097

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100